

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

**ANTHONY PARKER,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**HANKOOK TIRE MANUFACTURING  
TENNESSEE, LP,**

**Defendant.**

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**NO. 3:22-cv-00063**

**JUDGE CAMPBELL**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRENSLEY**

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), which was filed on September 28, 2022. (Doc. No. 25). Through the Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 16) be granted and this case be dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiff filed his Objections to Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 26) to which Defendant replied (Doc. No. 27). For the reasons discussed below, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation will be adopted and approved.

As an initial matter, before the Magistrate Judge issued the R&R, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Ascertain Status. (Doc. No. 24). The Clerk is directed to terminate that motion as **MOOT**.


Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.02, a district court reviews *de novo* any portion of a report and recommendation to which a specific objection is made. *United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 603 (6th Cir. 2001). General or conclusory objections are insufficient. *See Zimmerman v. Cason*, 354 F. Appx. 228, 230 (6th Cir. 2009). Without specific objections, “[t]he functions of the district court are effectively duplicated as both the magistrate and the district court perform identical tasks.” *Howard v. Sec. of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir.

1991). Thus, “only those specific objections to the magistrate’s report made to the district court will be preserved for appellate review.” *Id.* (quoting *Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987)). In conducting the review, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s objections to the R&R. (Doc. No. 26). It is clear from those objections that Plaintiff disagrees with the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. However, Plaintiff fails to provide a basis to reject or modify the R&R because his objections do not identify any specific factual or legal error the Magistrate Judge committed in determining that Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss should be granted. Rather, Plaintiff makes conclusory statements without further explanation or citation to the record. Objections which do not identify an error are meritless. *See Howard*, 932 F.2d at 509; *Drew v. Tessmer*, 36 F. App’x 561, 561 (6th Cir. 2002) (“The filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirements of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object.”); *VanDiver v. Martin*, 304 F. Supp. 2d 934, 937 (E.D. Mich. 2004) (“An ‘objection’ that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate’s suggested resolution ... is not an ‘objection’ as that term is used in this context.”).

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and considered Plaintiff’s objection, the Court concludes that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 25) should be adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**, and this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

It is so **ORDERED**.

  
WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE